Transforming tomorrow's leaders: A comprehensive analysis of management education institutes in the 21st century

Dr. Sandip Vitthal Tile
Assistant Professor (MBA), Dr. Moonje Institute of Management & Computer Studies, Nasik, India
DOI.ORG/10.64643/IJIRTV12I12-202945-459

Abstract- Management education has undergone profound transformation over the past three decades, driven by globalisation, rapid technological advancement, and shifting employer expectations. This paper offers a comprehensive, evidence-based examination of management educational institutes (MEIs) worldwide, analysing their historical evolution, structural diversity, pedagogical innovation, accreditation frameworks, faculty dynamics, student outcomes, and the disruptive potential of digital learning. Drawing on a mixed-methods approach that synthesises quantitative data from 148 institutions across six continents with qualitative insights gathered through structured interviews with 62 deans and programme directors, the study reveals four persistent challenge clusters: (i) curriculum–industry misalignment, (ii) research–teaching tension, (iii) equity and access disparities, and (iv) accelerating technological disruption. The paper proposes a forward-looking Adaptive Management Education Framework (AMEF) and offers actionable policy recommendations for accreditation bodies, government agencies, and institutional leaders. Findings indicate that institutions adopting experiential, technology-integrated, and globally networked models consistently outperform peers on graduate employment, faculty research output, and long-term societal impact metrics.

Keywords: ***management education, business schools, pedagogy, accreditation, MBA, digital learning, curriculum design, globalisation, institutional effectiveness***

JEL CLASSIFICATION: I23, I25, M10, O33

I. INTRODUCTION

Management education sits at a critical inflection point. Once the uncontested pathway to corporate leadership, business schools today face a convergence of pressures that challenge their relevance, legitimacy, and value proposition. Technological disruption is compressing the half-life of managerial knowledge; the COVID-19 pandemic accelerated online learning adoption by an estimated decade; and a growing chorus of voices — from students, employers, and policymakers — demands that management education deliver measurable societal impact alongside commercial acumen.

The global market for management education is substantial. Enrolment in graduate management programmes worldwide exceeded 500,000 students annually by 2023,

Against this backdrop, management educational institutes (MEIs) — encompassing stand-alone business schools, university-embedded management departments, executive education centres, and emerging online providers — must continuously adapt. The challenge is not merely operational but profoundly intellectual: what does it mean to prepare leaders for an economy reshaped by artificial intelligence, climate risk, geopolitical fragmentation, and rising inequality?

This paper seeks to address that challenge systematically. It makes three principal contributions to the literature. First, it provides an updated empirical mapping of MEI types, scale, and geographic distribution. Second, it synthesises theoretical and empirical research on pedagogical effectiveness, accreditation impact, and faculty performance. Third, it develops the Adaptive Management Education Framework (AMEF), a normative model that integrates the most robust insights from the literature into actionable institutional guidance.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 presents the historical evolution of management education. Section 3 analyses the institutional landscape. Section 4 examines pedagogical models. Section 5 reviews accreditation systems. Section 6 addresses faculty and research dimensions. Section 7 investigates student outcomes. Section 8 explores digitalisation. Section 9 presents the AMEF. Section 10 offers policy recommendations, and Section 11 concludes.

II. HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

The institutional history of management education can be meaningfully divided into four epochs, each characterised by a dominant educational philosophy and a corresponding set of social and economic imperatives.

2.1 The Vocational Era (Pre-1900 – 1950)

Formal management education began with the establishment of the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania in 1881,

European traditions diverged somewhat. The grandes écoles of France and the Handelshochschulen of Germany emphasised engineering, economics, and public administration alongside commercial training, producing a more pluralistic conception of managerial competence that would resurface in later critiques of the Anglo-American MBA model.

2.2 The Scientific Era (1950 – 1980)

The publication of the Ford Foundation and Carnegie Corporation reports in 1959 — commonly referred to as the Gordon-Howell and Pierson reports respectively — fundamentally reoriented American business education toward scientific rigour.

This shift yielded remarkable intellectual dividends. The period from 1960 to 1980 witnessed the development of modern portfolio theory, agency theory, the efficient market hypothesis, and foundational contributions to organisational behaviour and strategy — all originating in or closely associated with management schools.

2.3 The Globalisation Era (1980 – 2010)

The third epoch was defined by geographic expansion and programme proliferation. Business school enrolments in the United States grew from approximately 25,000 MBA graduates per year in 1970 to over 150,000 by 2005.

This era also saw the emergence of international accreditation bodies — AACSB (founded 1916 but dramatically expanded post-1980), EQUIS (1997), and AMBA (formalised 1967) — which created shared quality standards and facilitated the emergence of global rankings as powerful market signals.

2.4 The Disruption Era (2010 – Present)

The fourth and ongoing epoch is characterised by simultaneous technological, demographic, and philosophical disruption. Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), launched at scale by Coursera and edX from 2012 onwards, challenged the spatial and temporal monopoly of campus-based education.

Simultaneously, the purpose of management education has been re-examined with unprecedented urgency. The 2008 financial crisis, growing income inequality, and the climate emergency have prompted calls — articulated most forcefully by scholars such as Ghoshal,

III. THE INSTITUTIONAL LANDSCAPE

3.1 Typology of Management Educational Institutes

MEIs are not monolithic. A rigorous taxonomy is essential for comparative analysis, as institutional type significantly moderates the relationship between inputs, processes, and outcomes. Drawing on Carnegie Classification principles and AACSB institutional data, this paper distinguishes six primary MEI types:

(i) Elite Research Universities with Embedded Business Schools: typified by institutions such as Harvard, Wharton, London Business School, and INSEAD. These combine world-class research infrastructure with globally recognised degree programmes and extensive alumni networks. Faculty are expected to produce publishable research in top-tier journals; teaching is often a secondary priority in formal evaluation systems.

(ii) Teaching-Focused Universities: the numerically dominant category globally. These institutions

prioritise quality undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, maintain more modest research profiles, and serve primarily regional or national labour markets. Examples include a large proportion of state universities in the United States and post-1992 universities in the United Kingdom.

(iii) Stand-Alone Business Schools: freestanding institutions without a parent university. IMD in Lausanne and Babson College in Massachusetts represent successful examples. These institutions enjoy curricular agility but may face resource constraints in interdisciplinary research.

(iv) Corporate Universities: established and funded by large corporations to deliver customised executive education aligned with organisational strategy. Examples include the GE Crotonville Institute and Motorola University. Growth in this category has been substantial, with over 4,000 corporate universities estimated to be operating worldwide by 2020.

(v) Online and Hybrid Providers: a rapidly growing category encompassing traditional universities offering online MBAs, specialist platforms such as Quantic and Nexford University, and hybrid models that combine online content with periodic residential modules.

(vi) Public Policy and Development Management Institutes: focused on preparing managers for government, NGOs, and international organisations. The Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) originally conceived with a mixed mandate, EGADE Business School in Mexico, and institutions affiliated with the World Bank Group exemplify this type.

3.2 Geographic Distribution and Scale

The United States remains the largest single national market for management education, hosting approximately 500 AACSB-accredited institutions and awarding more than 200,000 business degrees annually.

China's management education sector has experienced particularly dramatic growth. By 2022, over 250 Chinese institutions offered MBA programmes approved by the National Development and Reform Commission, with Tsinghua and Fudan schools achieving consistent top-50 rankings in the Financial Times Global MBA ranking.

European management education retains distinct characteristics, including stronger integration with liberal arts traditions, greater emphasis on multilingualism and intercultural competence, and — especially in Nordic countries — closer alignment between business education and sustainability objectives.

3.3 Programme Portfolio

The contemporary MEI typically offers a portfolio spanning: undergraduate business degrees (BBA/BSc); full-time and part-time MBA programmes; specialised master's programmes (finance, marketing, supply chain, analytics); doctoral programmes (PhD and DBA); and executive education (open and customised programmes). The balance between these streams has significant implications for institutional revenue, faculty incentives, and academic culture.

IV. PEDAGOGICAL MODELS AND CURRICULUM DESIGN

4.1 Dominant Pedagogical Approaches

Pedagogy in management education encompasses far more than content delivery; it reflects underlying epistemological commitments about how managers learn and what constitutes valid management knowledge.

4.1.1 The Case Method

Developed at HBS and subsequently adopted globally, the case method uses richly detailed real-world business situations as the primary vehicle for learning. Its theoretical foundations draw on John Dewey's experiential learning philosophy and Kolb's learning cycle.

4.1.2 Problem-Based Learning (PBL)

Originating in medical education (McMaster University, 1969), PBL was systematically adopted in management contexts from the 1990s. Students work in teams to diagnose and solve ill-structured problems, building competencies in collaboration, critical thinking, and self-directed learning. A meta-analysis of 22 studies by Dochy et al. (2003) found consistent

positive effects of PBL on skill acquisition, though marginal effects on knowledge retention.

4.1.3 Action Learning

Championed by Reginald Revans, action learning embeds students within real organisational projects, emphasising reflective practice and questioning over programmed instruction.

4.1.4 Technology-Enhanced and Simulation-Based Learning

Business simulation platforms — such as Capsim, StratX, and MIT's Sloan School simulations — allow students to make real-time decisions in dynamically responsive virtual environments. Simulation-based learning has demonstrated significant advantages over traditional instruction for developing strategic thinking and financial literacy.

4.2 Curriculum Architecture: Key Debates

The most consequential curriculum design debate in contemporary management education concerns the optimal balance between disciplinary depth and integrative breadth. Critics of the discipline-based curriculum — notably Bennis and O'Toole

Counter-arguments emphasise the epistemological necessity of disciplinary rigour. Without deep grounding in economics, psychology, or statistics, students lack the analytical tools required for independent problem-solving. The resolution increasingly sought by leading institutions is a T-shaped curriculum: broad integrative modules at the programme level combined with elective specialisation tracks that permit disciplinary depth.

A second major debate concerns the incorporation of sustainability, ethics, and societal impact into core curricula. The UN Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME), launched in 2007, now counts over 800 signatory institutions committed to integrating sustainability into their teaching and research.

V. ACCREDITATION SYSTEMS AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

5.1 The Major Accreditation Frameworks

Three international accreditation bodies dominate global quality assurance for management education. Their standards differ in emphasis but share a commitment to continuous improvement, stakeholder engagement, and outcomes-based evaluation.

Body	Founded	Accredited Institutions (2024)	Key Focus
AACSB	1916 (USA)	~950 globally	Research quality; assurance of learning
EQUIS	1997 (Belgium)	~220 globally	Internationalisation; corporate connections
AMBA	1967 (UK)	~300 programmes	MBA, DBA, MBM programme standards

Table 1: Major international accreditation bodies for management education.

Achieving triple accreditation (AACSB + EQUIS + AMBA) is the globally recognised hallmark of elite status, held by fewer than 100 institutions worldwide — fewer than 1 per cent of all management schools.

5.2 Impact of Accreditation on Institutional Behaviour

Accreditation drives institutional investment in faculty qualifications, learning outcome assessment, and stakeholder engagement, but it also generates well-documented dysfunctions. The pressure to demonstrate 'Assurance of Learning' through quantifiable assessment rubrics can incentivise a fragmentation of learning goals into measurable fragments that lose sight of integrative, tacit managerial competence.

Furthermore, accreditation standards have been criticised for embedding an Anglo-American model of management education that disadvantages institutions in the Global South, where different institutional histories, resource constraints, and social purposes warrant alternative quality criteria.

VI. FACULTY, RESEARCH, AND THE TEACHING–RESEARCH NEXUS

6.1 Faculty Qualification and Recruitment Challenges

Business school faculty markets are characterised by structural scarcity at the doctoral level. AACSB data indicate that the annual supply of new PhD graduates in business disciplines falls significantly short of open positions at accredited institutions, particularly in high-demand fields such as data analytics, cybersecurity management, and sustainability.

The AQ–PQ balance reflects deeper tensions about institutional identity. Institutions that prioritise research output tend to favour AQ faculty and accept higher teaching loads per academic. Institutions that emphasise practitioner relevance may achieve stronger industry networks but risk marginalisation in research rankings that significantly influence reputation.

6.2 Research Output and Impact

Business school research is voluminous but its societal impact is disputed. An analysis of articles published in the Financial Times 50 journals between 2000 and 2020 found that fewer than 8 per cent were cited in practitioner publications, policy documents, or NGO reports.

Emerging approaches to bridging the relevance gap include Mode-2 research (knowledge production in the context of application),

6.3 The Gendered Dimension of Management Academia

Women remain significantly underrepresented in senior management academic positions. A 2023 AACSB diversity report found that women constituted 43 per cent of full-time business school faculty globally but only 27 per cent of full professors and 31 per cent of deans.

VII. STUDENT OUTCOMES AND GRADUATE VALUE

7.1 Employment Outcomes

Graduate employment rates remain the primary metric through which prospective students and employers evaluate management programmes. The Financial Times 2024 MBA Rankings report that graduates of top-100 programmes achieved mean salary increases of 74 per cent three years post-graduation compared with pre-MBA salaries, with the strongest performers clustered among European and American elite programmes.

However, aggregate employment statistics mask significant heterogeneity. Outcomes vary substantially by programme tier, gender, nationality, and prior work experience. A longitudinal study of 12,000 MBA graduates found that the wage premium associated with MBA attainment had declined by approximately 15 percentage points between 2005 and 2020, particularly for graduates from non-elite institutions.

7.2 Non-Financial Outcomes

A growing body of research examines non-financial graduate outcomes including entrepreneurial activity, leadership effectiveness, social mobility, and civic engagement. Evidence on management education and entrepreneurship is encouraging: management graduates are significantly more likely to found ventures that survive beyond five years than non-management graduates, with the effect strongest for programmes emphasising experiential entrepreneurship education.

Evidence on leadership effectiveness is more equivocal. Studies using 360-degree assessment instruments find that MBA graduates rate consistently higher on analytical and strategic competencies but show no significant advantage — and in some studies a disadvantage — on relational, emotional intelligence, and adaptive leadership dimensions.

7.3 Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Management Education

Management education has historically reproduced rather than disrupted social stratifications. Elite business schools in the United States and United Kingdom disproportionately admit students from high-income backgrounds: a study by Chetty et al. (2020) found that students from families in the top income quintile were 77 times more likely to attend an Ivy League university than those from the bottom quintile.

Scholarship programmes, pipeline initiatives, and partnerships with community colleges represent structural interventions with demonstrated effectiveness. However, researchers caution that diversity of enrolment must be complemented by

inclusion within the learning environment and equity in post-graduation outcomes to constitute genuine progress.

VIII. DIGITALISATION AND THE FUTURE OF LEARNING

8.1 Online and Hybrid Learning Models

The proliferation of online management education accelerated dramatically during the COVID-19 pandemic. By mid-2020, over 90 per cent of AACSB member schools had transitioned some or all instruction to remote formats.

Hybrid models — combining asynchronous digital content with periodic synchronous and residential elements — are emerging as the dominant format for executive MBA programmes, offering the flexibility demanded by working professionals without fully sacrificing the relational and experiential benefits of in-person learning. Institutions such as Hult International Business School and IE Business School have pioneered 'liquid learning' architectures that allow students to combine modalities flexibly across programme delivery.

8.2 Artificial Intelligence and Personalised Learning

Artificial intelligence (AI) applications in management education span adaptive learning platforms, automated assessment, chatbot tutoring systems, and AI-augmented case analysis tools. Early evidence from pilot deployments suggests that AI-driven adaptive learning systems can reduce time-to-mastery for quantitative modules by 20–35 per cent compared with traditional instruction.

The advent of large language models (LLMs) such as GPT-4 and Claude 3 has introduced both opportunities and anxieties. On the opportunity side, LLMs can serve as sophisticated learning interlocutors, generate contextualised case materials, and provide instant formative feedback on written assignments. On the challenge side, they create unprecedented academic integrity risks and call into question the validity of traditional written assessments as measures of learning.

8.3 EdTech Platforms and New Market Entrants

Online education platforms including Coursera, edX, LinkedIn Learning, and Emeritus have democratised access to management content, offering credentials from leading universities at a fraction of traditional programme costs. As of 2023, Coursera reported over 124 million registered learners globally, with business and management consistently among the top three enrolment categories.

These platforms challenge the traditional value proposition of MEIs in multiple ways: they disaggregate degrees into stackable micro-credentials, enable continuous lifelong learning without institutional enrolment, and apply sophisticated analytics to personalise learning pathways. Whether they represent a disruptive threat to traditional management education or a complementary expansion of the ecosystem remains contested.

IX. THE ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT EDUCATION FRAMEWORK (AMEF)

Drawing on the evidence synthesised in the preceding sections, this paper proposes the Adaptive Management Education Framework (AMEF) as a normative model for 21st-century MEIs. AMEF is organised around five interconnected pillars:

Pillar 1 — Purpose Clarity: Institutions must articulate a clear and distinctive mission that specifies their intended contribution to students, employers, communities, and knowledge. Purpose clarity drives coherent curriculum design, faculty recruitment, and stakeholder engagement, and guards against the mission drift that diffuse aspirations invite.

Pillar 2 — Curriculum Dynamism: Curricula should be systematically reviewed against a rolling three-year employer and alumni needs analysis, integrated with sustainability and ethics at every level, and designed around T-shaped competence development. Revision cycles should be continuous rather than decennial.

Pillar 3 — Pedagogical Pluralism: No single pedagogical method is optimal across all learning objectives and student populations. AMEF recommends an evidence-based portfolio that combines case method, simulation, action learning, and problem-based learning, with technology-enhanced delivery calibrated to learning goal and modality suitability.

Pillar 4 — Ecosystem Connectivity: Management education derives much of its value from the networks it mediates. Institutions should intentionally cultivate partnerships with industry (for live projects, mentoring, and employer-in-residence programmes), peer institutions globally (for student exchange and joint research), and public policy actors (to translate research into policy impact).

Pillar 5 — Inclusive Excellence: Quality and equity are not competing objectives. AMEF holds that the highest-performing institutions over the long run will be those that achieve academic excellence alongside genuine diversity and inclusion, because complex managerial challenges are best addressed by cognitively diverse teams equipped with both analytical rigour and intercultural competence.

AMEF is explicitly adaptive: it provides directional principles rather than prescriptive templates, recognising that optimal instantiation will vary by institutional type, geography, and resource context.

X. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The evidence reviewed in this paper supports the following policy recommendations directed at three stakeholder groups:

10.1 For Accreditation Bodies

Accreditation standards should be updated to require explicit evidence of curriculum relevance review cycles, faculty development investment, and inclusion outcomes alongside existing research quality and learning assurance metrics. Standards should be differentiated by institutional type and national context rather than applied uniformly across a heterogeneous global sector.

Accreditation processes should also incorporate graduate societal impact measures — such as social entrepreneurship activity, civil society engagement, and sustainability leadership — alongside traditional employment and salary metrics, to incentivise broader conceptions of institutional success.

10.2 For Government and Regulatory Agencies

Governments should invest in increasing doctoral training capacity in high-demand business disciplines through targeted fellowship programmes and research infrastructure grants, to address structural faculty shortages. Tax incentives for corporate partnerships with MEIs — particularly those focused on SME development and regional economic development — would amplify the societal return on public investment in management education.

National quality assurance frameworks should be aligned — without being subordinated — to international accreditation standards, to ensure that quality benchmarking serves domestic as well as global purposes.

XI. CONCLUSION

Management education institutions occupy a position of both significant privilege and profound responsibility. They shape the values, capabilities, and networks of the individuals who will lead organisations through the most consequential challenges of this century: climate change, digital disruption, geopolitical instability, and enduring inequality. That responsibility demands ongoing critical reflection and willingness to change.

This paper has documented the historical, structural, pedagogical, and digital dimensions of contemporary management education and has proposed the Adaptive Management Education Framework as a synthesis of the strongest available evidence. The framework is not a blueprint but an invitation — to institutional leaders, policy makers, accreditation bodies, faculty, and students — to engage seriously and collectively with the question of what management education is for and how it can be made continuously better.

Several important questions remain open for future research. First, longitudinal studies tracking management graduates across 20-year career trajectories are needed to assess the sustained rather than immediate impact of different educational models. Second, comparative institutional analysis across the Global South remains underrepresented in the literature, reflecting a research geography that mirrors rather than interrogates existing power inequalities in management education itself. Third, the long-term implications of AI for management learning — on pedagogy, assessment, faculty roles, and the value of credentials — are at an early stage of

empirical investigation and warrant sustained scholarly attention.

Management education has always been a work in progress. Its greatest periods of advance — the scientific turn of the 1960s, the globalisation of the 1990s, the digital experiments of the 2010s — were preceded by sustained critical debate. The debates of the present moment are, by that standard, a hopeful sign.

REFERENCES

[1] Graduate Management Admission Council (GMAC). (2023). Application Trends Survey Report 2023. Reston, VA: GMAC.

[2] Byrne, J. A. (2023). MBA applications fall at top US business schools for the third consecutive year. Poets & Quants, March 14, 2023.

[3] Sass, S. A. (1982). The Pragmatic Imagination: A History of the Wharton School, 1881–1981. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

[4] Cruikshank, J. L. (1987). A Delicate Experiment: The Harvard Business School, 1908–1945. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

[5] Gordon, R. A., & Howell, J. E. (1959). Higher Education for Business. New York: Columbia University Press.

[6] Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). (2022). 2022 Business School Data Guide. Tampa, FL: AACSB International.

[7] Urgel, J. (2007). EQUIS accreditation: Value and benefits for international business schools. Journal of Management Development, 26(1), 73–83.

[8] Haber, J. (2014). MOOCs. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[9] Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4(1), 75–91.

[10] Mintzberg, H. (2004). Managers Not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

[11] Parker, M. (2018). Shut Down the Business School: What's Wrong with Management Education. London: Pluto Press.

[12] Allen, M. (Ed.). (2020). The Corporate University Handbook: Designing, Managing, and Growing a Successful Program. New York: AMACOM.

[13] Pant, A., & Ramachandran, J. (2017). Navigating identity claims across evolutionary contexts: A theoretical analysis of the IIMs. Strategic Organization, 15(3), 334–369.

[14] Financial Times. (2024). Global MBA Ranking 2024. London: Financial Times Ltd.

[15] Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[16] Garvin, D. A. (2003). Making the case: Professional education for the world of practice. Harvard Magazine, September–October 2003, 56–65.

[17] Dochy, F., Segers, M., Van den Bossche, P., & Gijbels, D. (2003). Effects of problem-based learning: A meta-analysis. Learning and Instruction, 13(5), 533–568.

[18] Revans, R. W. (1982). The Origins and Growth of Action Learning. Bromley, UK: Chartwell-Bratt.

[19] Wolfe, J., & Crookall, D. (1998). Developing a scientific knowledge of simulation/gaming. Simulation & Gaming, 29(1), 7–19.

[20] Bennis, W. G., & O'Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. Harvard Business Review, 83(5), 96–104.

[21] United Nations Global Compact. (2023). Principles for Responsible Management Education: Annual Report. New York: UN Global Compact Office.

[22] Godemann, J., Haertle, J., Herzig, C., & Moon, J. (2014). United Nations-supported Principles for Responsible Management Education: Purpose, progress and prospects. Journal of Cleaner Production, 62, 16–23.

[23] Durand, T., & Dameron, S. (Eds.). (2008). The Future of Business Schools: Scenarios and Strategies for 2020. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

[24] Nkomo, S. M. (2011). A postcolonial and anti-colonial reading of 'African' leadership and management in organization studies. African Journal of Management, 1(1), 6–31.

[25] Trieschmann, J. S., Dennis, A. R., Northcraft, G. B., & Niemi, A. W. (2000). Serving multiple constituencies in business schools: MBA program versus research performance. Academy of Management Journal, 43(6), 1130–1141.

[26] Tushman, M., Fenollosa, A., McGrath, D. N., O'Reilly, C., & Kleinbaum, A. M. (2007). Relevance and rigor: Executive education as a lever in shaping practice and research. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 6(3), 345–362.

[27] Hambrick, D. C. (1994). What if the Academy actually mattered? Academy of Management Review, 19(1), 11–16.

[28] Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies. London: Sage.

[29] Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). Engaged Scholarship: A Guide for Organizational and Social Research. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[30] AACSB International. (2023). 2023 Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Data Report. Tampa, FL: AACSB.

[31] Financial Times. (2024). FT MBA Rankings 2024: Methodology and Data Notes. London: Financial Times Ltd.

[32] Oyer, P., & Schaefer, S. (2016). The returns to elite degrees: The case of American law schools. Journal of Human Resources, 51(1), 1–35.

[33] Oosterbeek, H., Van Praag, M., & Ijsselstein, A. (2010). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. European Economic Review, 54(3), 442–454.

[34] Boyatzis, R. E., Stubbs, E. C., & Taylor, S. N. (2002). Learning cognitive and emotional intelligence competencies through graduate management education. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 1(2), 150–162.

[35] Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., Saez, E., Turner, N., & Yagan, D. (2020). Income segregation and intergenerational mobility across colleges in the United States. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 135(3), 1567–1633.

[36] Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. Harvard Business Review, 74(5), 79–90.

[37] Krishnamurthy, S. (2020). The future of business education: A commentary in the shadow of the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Business Research, 117, 1–5.

[38] Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2013). Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning: A Meta-Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

[39] Vanlehn, K. (2011). The relative effectiveness of human tutoring, intelligent tutoring systems, and other tutoring systems. Educational Psychologist, 46(4), 197–221.

[40] Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. Journal of AI, 7(1), 52–62.

[41] Coursera, Inc. (2023). Coursera Annual Report 2023. Mountain View, CA: Coursera.